

Subject: HELCOM MONAS 8 nov 2005.comments

From: <Yngve.Brodin@naturvardsverket.se>

Date: Tue, 20 Dec 2005 17:28:54 +0100

To: <jerzy.bartnicki@met.no>, <marina.varygina@msceast.org>

CC: <torunn.berg@met.no>, <Tove.Lundeberg@naturvardsverket.se>, <Bertil.Hakansson@smhi.se>, <Hakan.Staaf@naturvardsverket.se>

Dear Jerzy and Marina

You asked for comments on same HELCOM documents not later than the 20th of December...

... so here they are just in time.

Wish you all the best for the New Year to come

Yngve Brodin
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency

Comments:

Document 5/8

- I'm quite pleased with the content and structure of the report. The suggestions I made last year seem to have been taken care of. So I feel it is no need for me to give any specific comments on this year's report.
- An overall comment is that I think that it is not so interesting to compare results of 2003 with the results of the previous year. Much more interesting is to analyse trends over several years. I don't however suggest you to do any changes in the present report considering the comments under Document 5/10 (focus on the indicators fact sheets including a trend analyses).
- You suggested that this kind of report is not needed every year. I agree and you will find my comments on this issue below under "Document 5/10".

Document 5/9

- A very interesting, comprehensive and important report.
- In the Executive Summary under the heading "Deposition to the Baltic" it would be interesting to have words expressing something like the following; "All three scenarios suggest higher deposition in 2010 than in 2003. Scenario 1 with reference to LRTAP Gothenburg protocol indicates an **increase** be around 14 per cent". This is indeed something to consider and should be highlighted also in the press.
- Why is Scenario 2 chosen? Scenario 2 (which is 10 per cent better than Scenario 1) could have been replaced by a scenario showing how much nitrogen emissions should be reduced in order to avoid an increased deposition of nitrogen on the Baltic Sea. Another alternative to Scenario 2 is a scenario showing e.g. a 10 or 20 per cent reduced input of nitrogen to the Baltic Sea. Of course you can't change the scenarios now, but the alternatives could be taken into consideration when new scenario analyses are needed.
- I don't think you should state that the CLE scenario is the most likely description (cf. e.g. Executive summary). It is a kind of political judgement which I believe EMEP should avoid.
- In the "Introduction" it is stated that the scenarios are "agricultural policy scenarios". Is this really the case? To me the scenarios seem to consider much more than agriculture.
- One practical issue is that such large reports as this are difficult to open and print out. Many people interested in the report might give up waiting. I suggest that the Executive summary would be available separately.

Document 5/10

- It is indeed funny that I wrote down very similar thoughts about the EMEP input to HELCOM as you suggested in Document 5/10
- I fully agree that the indicator fact sheets should be the main annual reporting from EMEP, and that thematic reports should be produced based on the needs of the PLC-reports, which might be every 4 or 5 year.
- I am in favour of replacing HCH with other more important POPs. Dioxins/furans might be interesting, but I suggest that you should consider also other alternatives taking into account data available from different Baltic countries. It might also be interesting to show deposition of PAH compounds such as BaP and/or brominated flame retardants such as PBDE. Could you make a study during 2006 on what "air data" on POPs are available from the Baltic Sea and the possibilities (and uncertainties) to calculate deposition on the Baltic Sea. Such a study could then be sent to HELCOM member states to consider what POPs are most interesting to include in the Indicator fact sheets.
- I think that the indicator fact sheets for emission and deposition of nitrogen, metals and POPs are too ambitious. Most important are 1) *diagrams on deposition trends* for the whole Baltic Sea. These trends are essential to follow up if targets can be reached. Also interesting are 2) *maps on deposition trends for the six sub-basins*. Concerning emissions I think it is enough with 3) a figure *showing trends of total nitrogen emissions from the whole Baltic Sea*. and finally 4) a table on *emissions of total nitrogen emissions from Baltic and other countries* of importance for the airborne input to the Baltic Sea.
- I suggest that other information suggested for the indicator fact sheets should be raw data in annexes or preferably easy

available by a link to an EMEP web page. This concerns information such as 5) emissions of metals and POPs, 6) emissions of ammonia and nitrogen oxides, 7) concentrations in air and precipitation of nitrogen, metals and POPs and 8) metadata information.

- The Indicator fact sheet are mainly for non-experts short in time and should therefore only include the most important information. It is also important to be able to up-to-date the Indicator fact sheets annually. A restricted number of maps and diagrams will make the up-dating process a more easy task.